Actions arising from the meeting of the Task Force on instruments 7 June2002

Chair: P. Kind (RTD-B)

Present: L. Karapiperis (RTD-B2), J. Magan (INFSO), M. Moller (INFSO), N. Pantalos (ENTR), C. Profilis (RTD-B2), C.Renier (RTD-B2), M. Richards (RTD-G4), E. Rille (RTD-L4), K. Rouhana (INFSO), I.Sabater (TREN), G. Stroud (RTD-A2), L. van den Brande (RTD-A 2) R. Zimmermann (INFSO)

Weekly events

Rules for Participation: Following the Trialogue on 5 June, technical meetings involving the three institutions are attempting to resolve outstanding issues. ITRE plans to vote on 10 June, with the plenary on 12 June.

Evaluation criteria

The TF agreed that "a minimum basic set of issues", should be drawn up for each instrument, interpreting the evaluation criteria for that instrument. This minimum basic set would be applicable to all priority themes, but could be supplemented with further issues when a priority theme considers it appropriate.

The basic set of issues for IPs was discussed. **LvdB** will circulate a revised set on the basis of the discussion.

Content of proposals

Concerning the content of proposals, it was agreed to examine this with representatives of the info-pack-working group (**Mr Rosenbaum**), once the basic set of issues has fully stabilised.

Two-stage submission

The process of a two-stage submission and its impact on the use of criteria and the content of the negotiation stage will be examined in a later meeting. **LvdB** will provide latest texts from the evaluation group.

Frequently asked questions

The FAQs resulting from the correspondents meeting of the previous Friday had been circulated to the TF members for comment. It was agreed to re-work the FAQs, distinguishing between FAQs that ought to be addressed by the working documents themselves and other FAQs, if any, that could be answered separately. (**CP**, **CR**).

Networks of excellence

In the current state of uncertainty over the financial regime for NoEs, only the question of a definition of a "researcher" for the purposes of calculating the grant was discussed. There was a strongly held majority view that current definition of either a PhD or at least four years experience should be maintained.

Outstanding issues

An updated list of outstanding issues regarding the instruments together with a work plan for the remainder of the TF's work will be circulated (CR).

The importance of strengthening links with other FP6 working groups was noted. The content and structure of the work programmes is another issue that needs to be discussed.

Next meetings

Friday 14 June, (9.00, SDME 8E)

- Relaunch of the working group on **cost models** for instruments implemented with a grant to the budget. Agreement on basic principles for the group's work.
- **SMEs** (on basis of a document by the SME unit regarding stimulation of SMEs participation in the new instruments).
- **STREPs** (on basis of a revised discussion document from **CP**).

Friday 21 June (9.00, SDME 7E)

- **cost models** for the instruments implemented with a grant to the budget.
- the working of audit certificates.
- **financial regime for NoE** (if agreement by then with Council and EP).

Friday 28 June (9.00, SDME 1F)

- evaluation criteria, particularly for NoEs and STREPs;
- **two-stage submission** (on the basis of a document from the evaluation group (**LvdB**).
- **content of proposals** (on basis of first draft of the infopack from the infopack group (+ **Juergen Rosenbaum**).
- results and implications of the EoI exercise(+ **David Miles**).
- procedures (+ **Robert Krengel**).

Friday 5 July (9.00, SDME 2F)

• Final discussion of the updated IP/NoE/STRP working documents with a view to publication on the web by 8 July.

- First discussion of working documents for co-ordination actions and specific support actions (on basis of drafts by **MM**).
- Discussion of the role of the project officer, particularly in negotiation and contract follow-up.

CR 07/06/02 19:41:19